

REMARKS

This responds to the Office Action mailed on October 29, 2004.

Claims 1-40 are amended, no claims are canceled, and claims 41-63 are added; as a result, claims 1-63 are now pending in this application.

The Applicant's Representative, Barbara Clark, placed a phone call to the Examiner on January 28, 2005, seeking clarification of the allowable subject matter. At the time of filing this response on January 31, 2005, the Examiner had not returned the phone call, although Applicant now believes that the claims are allowable in their present form.

The specification has been amended to correct typographical and grammatical errors and to add text from the original claims. No new matter has been added as a result.

The amendments made herein have been to clarify the claims and to correct typographical or grammatical errors and are not intended to limit the scope of equivalents to which any claim element may be entitled. The amendments to the claims and new claims have support throughout the specification including on pages 10 and 12 and in FIGS. 5 and 6. No new matter has been added as a result. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the above-identified application in view of the amendments above and the remarks that follow.

Objections to the Title

The Examiner objected to the title of the application as not being descriptive.

It is believed the amendment made to the title obviates this objection.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Objections to the Abstract

The Examiner objected to the Abstract due to improper language and format.

Although the abstract was short, Applicant could not find improper language and format. However, the Abstract has been amended for clarification.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Objections to the Specification

The Examiner objected to the specification due to informalities.

It is believed that the amendments made to the specification obviate these objections.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Objections to the Drawings

The Examiner objected to the drawings due to informalities.

A complete set of formal drawings is provided herewith, including a corrected FIG. 5 (labeled as a REPLACEMENT SHEET) showing the reference number 410.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Objections to the Claims

The Examiner objected to the claims 1-16, 18-24, 26-30, 32 and 34-40 due to informalities. It is believed that the amendments made herein to claims 1-16, 18-24, 26-30, 32 and 34-40 obviate these objections.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

§102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1, 2, 4-10, 12-18, 20-26, 28-34 and 36-40 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by DiBene, II et al. (U.S. 6,356,448 B1).

The Office Action asserts that DiBene teaches various elements of the claims. The Applicant does not admit that DiBene is prior art and reserves the right to swear behind this reference at a later date. Nevertheless, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are distinguishable over DiBene for the reasons argued below.

Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action has not established a *prima facie* case of anticipation of the present claims. Anticipation requires the disclosure in a single prior art reference of each element of the claim under consideration. *In re Dillon* 919 F.2d 688, 16 USPQ 2d 1897, 1908 (Fed. Cir. 1990) (en banc), cert. denied, 500 U.S. 904 (1991). It is not enough, however, that the prior art reference discloses all the claimed elements in isolation. Rather, "[a]nticipation requires the presence in a single prior reference disclosure of each and every

element of the claimed invention, *arranged as in the claim.*" *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co.*, 730 F.2d 1452, 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984) (citing *Connell v. Sears, Roebuck & Co.*, 722 F.2d 1542, 220 USPQ 193 (Fed. Cir. 1983)) (emphasis added). "The *identical invention* must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989); MPEP § 2131 (emphasis added).

DiBene discusses an inter-circuit encapsulated packaging for power delivery. The mechanical couplers in DiBene are multi-piece standoff assemblies which require a separate fastener for installation.

In contrast, claim 1, as amended, recites a standoff/electrical device comprising a standoff device arrangement to provide predetermined control of a standoff distance between electrical components mounted together with opposing conductive grid array patterns, wherein the standoff device arrangement comprises a plurality of rigid one-piece standoff pins; and an electrical function structure to provide a predetermined electrical function to at least one of the electrical components.

Claims 9, 17, 25 and 33, as amended, also recite either a standoff device (claims 9 and 17) or a standoff member (claims 25 and 33) comprising a plurality of rigid one-piece standoff pins.

Applicant cannot find, in DiBene, any type of one-piece standoff device. Rather, the standoff devices of DiBene are limited to multi-piece standoff assemblies. DiBene, therefore, does not appear to teach each element of claims 1, 9, 17, 25 and 33.

Dependent claims depend from and further define the independent claims. Claims 2 and 4-8 depend from independent claim 1, claims 10 and 12-16 depend from independent claim 8, claims 18 and 20-24 depend from independent claim 17, claims 26 and 28-32 depend from independent claim 25, and claims 34 and 36-40 depend from independent claim 33. For at least the reasons presented above, it is believed that dependent claims 2, 4-8, 10-16, 18-24, 26-32 and 34-40 are in condition for allowance.

DiBene does not anticipate the claims, as amended. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 9, 17, 25 and 33 are allowable in their present form. Since claims 2, 4-8, 10-16, 18-24,

26-32 and 34-40 depend from and further define claims 1, 9, 17, 25 and 33, these claims are also believed to be allowable in their present form.

Notification to this effect is respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 3, 11, 19, 27 and 35 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant respectfully submits that all the claims, including dependent claims 3, 11, 19, 27 and 35, are allowable in their present form for all the reasons stated herein.

Notification to this effect is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's attorney, Barbara Clark at (515) 233-3865, or Applicant's below-named representative at (612) 373-6970 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,
REBECCA A. JESSEP ET AL.

By their Representatives,
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
Attorneys for Intel Corporation
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402
(612) 349-9592

Date Jan. 31, 2005

By Ann M. McCrackin
Ann M. McCrackin
Reg. No. 42,858

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: MS Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 31st day of January 2005.

Dennis Kamph

Name

Signature

IN THE DRAWINGS

A complete set of formal drawings is provided herewith, including a corrected FIG. 5 (labeled as a REPLACEMENT SHEET) showing the reference number 410.